DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 381 083 HE 028 221

TITLE	Academic Freedom and University Autonomy. Proceedings of the International Conference (Sinaia, Romania, May 5-7, 1992). Papers on Higher Education Series.
INSTITUTION	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Bucharest (Romania). European Centre for Higher Education.
REPORT NO	ISBN-92-9069-124-7
PUB DATE	92
NOTE	58p.; For a related document, see HE 028 222.
AVAILABLE FROM	CEPES UNESCO, 39 Stirbei Voda St., Bucharest, Romania R-70732.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Freedom; College Faculty; College Instruction; College Role; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Institutional Autonomy; School Community Relationship; Social Change; *Universities
IDENTIFIERS	Europe

ABSTRACT

This publication contains the proceedings of an international conference on academic freedom and university autonomy attended by 180 scholars and representatives from 30 countries. The conference's official statement, the Sinaia Statement, follows an introduction. The Statement calls for a new understanding between universities and society and a reaffirmation and revitalization of the principles of academic freedom and university autonomy in light of the current profound social changes and demands placed on institutions of higher education. Covered in the account of the proceedings are the opening of the conference, development of its working document, description of key-note speeches, summaries of working group debates with their preliminaries and conclusions, description of the closing session and of the adoption of the Statement. Also included are descriptions of round-table discussions of a United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) study on the status of higher education teaching personnel, and description of a discussion of implementation of the European Universities Network. Final sections contain the text of the conference's working document, "Academic Freedom and University Autonomy," and the discussion and description of the observation of the 20th anniversary of the European Centre for Higher Education. (Contains 12 references.) (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 381 083

PAPERS ON HIGHER EDUCATION

CEPES

UNESCO

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND UNIVERSITY AUTONOMY

Proceedings of the International Conference
5 - 7 May 1992, Sinaia, Romania

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CEPES

F. Eberhard

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ME028221

1992

CEPES Papers on Higher Education

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

AND

UNIVERSITY AUTONOMY

Proceedings of the International Conference

5 - 7 May 1992, Sinaia, Romania

Bucharest
1992

ISBN 92 - 9069 - 124 - 7

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD 1

SINAIA STATEMENT 4

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SINAIA CONFERENCE 6

I. OPENING OF THE CONFERENCE 6

1. Organization 6

2. Working Document 7

II. KEY-NOTE SPEECHES 8

III. WORKING GROUP DEBATES 13

1. Preliminaries 13

2. Conclusions 15

IV. THE CLOSING SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE 27

V. ADOPTION OF THE "SINAIA STATEMENT" 30

ROUND-TABLE ON THE UNESCO STUDY CONCERNING THE STATUS OF HIGHER EDUCATION TEACHING PERSONNEL 31

ROUND-TABLE ON "NETWORK: EUROPEAN UNIVERSITIES" 33

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND UNIVERSITY AUTONOMY: Working Document 35

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF CEPES 51

FOREWORD

CEPES is proud to present the proceedings of the International Conference on Academic Freedom and University Autonomy held in Sinaia, Romania, from 5 to 7 May 1992. The Conference was organized by CEPES, the UNESCO European Center for Higher Education, the Standing Conference of Rectors, Presidents, and Vice-Chancellors of the European Universities (CRE), the National Rectors' Conference of Romania (NRCR), and the Romanian National Commission for UNESCO, in co-operation with the Council of Europe. The Conference brought together some 180 distinguished scholars, including representatives of international organizations, from about 30 countries.

The debates, which took place in the three Working Groups, focussed on a thorough analysis of academic freedom and university autonomy as viewed from various perspectives, including the management of higher education institutions, the penetration of market rules into universities, and the role of higher education in a pluralist society.

The participants in the Conference all agreed that a university is the repository of truth, be it historical, cultural, or scientific; it is the place where minds, embarking on the quest for truth, meet and clash in pursuit of this ideal. Minds so-fashioned are the individual carriers and transmitters of past and future thought, of tradition, and of innovation. The university, by its very nature, is the collective mind that bears the truth of all who pass through it, continuously revising and improving scientific knowledge and concepts in a climate of and according to the principle of truthfulness. It is the place where the scholarly elite, the critical intellectual mind of a society, takes shape, discards obsolete findings, and affirms and reassesses other interpretations of truth.

In order to function as a hotbed of knowledge, a university must benefit from and respect a number of basic norms of conduct. Although not a fundamental human right, academic freedom is a basic university right. Academics must be free to choose what they will put forward in their teaching, research, or publications. Academic freedom is the freedom of individual academics to follow a particular path of intellectual conception and activity within particular higher education institutions.

The second crucial institutional right of a higher education institution is university autonomy. It is the right to fully exercise and practice academic freedom and self-govermment with regard to internal activities. It is the right of a university to be free of interference by the state and by any other external power as regards its operations and affairs.

Without these two basic rights, universities will never fully accomplish their primary tasks of transmitting and discovering truth.

Politically, economically, and teritorially, Europe is in a state of mutation; it is undergoing perpetual transition. Amidst the resulting turmoil, universities are called upon to create and to maintain stable and peaceful zones for the dissemination of knowledge and research, far from the politics of expediency. Universities all over the world are concerned about how to respond rationally and comprehensively to those forces originating in the social environment and how to meet the growing popular demand for higher education as well as for expanding national needs for economic, cultural, and technological development.

In this sense, the International Conference on Academic Freedom and University Autonomy served as a forum for the exchange of ideas and experience as well as for the exploration of new principles and modalities of action to be adapted to present and future trends and challenges.

The proceedings of the Conference, as we have presented them below, include the working document, information about the key-note speeches, summaries of the working group debates, and the conclusions and recommendations adopted at the end of the Conference. The volume opens with the **Sinaia Statement**, an important outcome of the Conference, adopted by consensus on the 7th of May 1992. The Sinaia Conference by its Statement "urges UNESCO to give the matter of academic freedom and university autonomy its utmost attention and to prepare an international instrument for the protection and promotion of these values".

CEPES uses this opportunity to thank all those who contributed to the success of this conference, firstly, our co-organizers, the representatives of the Romanian institutions and authorities, secondly, Professor M. Malitza, whose expertise we were happy to use for the working document, thirdly, the speakers at the conference, and fourthly, all the participants who both provided us with papers and made discussions so thorough and interesting.

The support from UNESCO headquarters - Professor C. Power, Assistant Director-General, Head of the Sector of Education, and the Division for Higher Education - was very encouraging. The continued interest from Professor F. Mayor, the Director-General of UNESCO, was an inspiration and stimulation for all the CEPES staff.

It is to the CEPES staff my final thanks go. Their tireless and loyal efforts made this conference possible. A special mention should be made of Professor L. Vlasceanu, programme specialist and Miss R. Constantinescu, assistant editor, who were more particularly in charge of the intellectual and practical preparations of the conference and also for the follow-up, including this publication.

Carin Berg

Director of CEPES

SINAIA STATEMENT

1. *The* **Sinaia International Conference on Academic Freedom and University Autonomy** *met at a moment of great change. All institutions of society, and especially universities, are affected by the social, political, and economic upheavals surrounding them. Indeed, universities have a singular opportunity and obligation to contribute to the development of society and to play an active role in shaping the societies they serve.*

History has shown that violations of academic freedom and institutional autonomy have high costs in intellectual regression, social alienation and economic stagnation. In light of profound social changes and new demands placed on universities, there is a need to forge a new understanding between universities and society. A reaffirmation and revitalization of the principles of academic freedom and university autonomy are imperative.

2. *This is not the first time that universities have faced the challenges of social, political, economic and cultural transformations. Universities have proved themselves to be adaptable while at the same time honouring their historic commitment to scholarship and teaching. The ability of universities to maintain both their traditional vocation and their relevance to society in the 21st century will require that they view these changes as challenges to their imagination and resourcefulness and not as threats to their mission. The knowledge and know-how of universities will be crucial in tackling the many challenges society faces: cultural and national separatism, the protection of the environment, the development of human potential, to name but a few. These problems will not be easily resolved, nor, certainly, will they be resolved by universities alone. But universities can and should play a key role in the quest for solutions.*

3. *The defining characteristic of the university is its commitment to open and independent inquiry. This characteristic also distinguishes the nature of university research, which, unlike partisan research, seeks knowledge and understanding in a completely unrestricted manner. The same principles of unfettered inquiry apply to teaching and the dissemination of knowledge. This commitment to the pursuit of truth gives universities all over the world their universal values and enables them to embark on the important paths of regional and international co-operation, which are so important to the vitality of the modern university.*

In affirming the value of academic freedom, the Conference participants recognize that universities themselves have a responsibility to

nurture academic freedom within their own communities. Similarly, governments and the public must respect the rights of universities to serve as centres of completely free inquiry and of social criticism.

4. *As part of this revitalised understanding with society, universities recognize their obligation to demonstrate to decision-makers and to the public at large the value of their enterprise. Specifically; universities must develop convincing mechanisms of evaluation which demonstrate their quality and effectiveness.*

5. *Universities have an obligation to speak out against all kinds of intolerant behaviour. This obligation takes on particular urgency in light of the forces recently unleashed in Europe and elsewhere in the world. To reaffirm the values of tolerance and the primacy of peaceful solutions is not to ignore the significance of different cultural traditions but to promote mutual understanding and co-operation. Without them, there can be no civilised life at all, let alone any role for the university.*

RECOMMENDATION

The Sinaia International Conference on Academic Freedom and University Autonomy,

- *aware of the increasing international importance attached to higher education and its impact on society;*
- *recognizing the concepts of academic freedom and university autonomy as essential elements for the fulfilment of the mission of universities,*
- *stressing the importance of the notion of the accountability and the social responsibility of universities,*
- *taking into account the efforts to develop an international understanding on academic freedom and university autonomy such as the Magna Charta of European Universities (Bologna, 1988), the declarations of Lima (1988), Kampala (1988) and Dar-es-Salam (1990), and the outcome of several recent meetings of international academic organizations,*

urges UNESCO to give the matter of academic freedom and university autonomy its utmost attention and to prepare an international instrument for the protection and promotion of these values.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SINAIA CONFERENCE

I. OPENING OF THE CONFERENCE

1. Organization

The International Conference on **Academic Freedom and University Autonomy** was convened in Sinaia, Romania, from 5 to 7 May, 1992, by UNESCO at the request of the National Rectors' Conference of Romania (NRCR) and with the support of the Romanian National Commission for UNESCO. The organization of the Conference was undertaken by CEPES, the UNESCO European Centre for Higher Education, the 20th anniversary of which was celebrated simultaneously. Other co-operating organizations included the Council of Europe and the Standing Conference of Rectors, Presidents, and Vice-Chancellors of the European Universities (CRE).

After Ms. C. Berg, Director of CEPES, had opened the Conference, Professor M. Golu, Minister of Education and Sciences and President of the National Commission of Romania for UNESCO, delivered a welcoming address. On the same occasion, Professor Federico Mayor, Director-General of UNESCO, Professor Hans van Ginkel, Bureau Member of CRE, representing its President, H. Seidel, prevented by a transport strike from attending, and Mr. Maitland Stobart, respresenting Ms. C. Lalumière, Secretary General of the Council of Europe, addressed the Conference.

The Bureau of the Conference was unanimously elected as follows: Professor V.N. Constantinescu, President of the National Rectors' Conference of Romania, who acted as President of the Bureau; Mrs. M. Green, Vice President of the American Council on Education; Professor W.J. Kamba, President of the International Association of Universities, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Zimbabwe; Professor H. van Ginkel, Rector Magnificus of Utrecht University, and Professor J. Thorens, former Rector of the University of Geneva, past President of the United Nations University, of the International Association of Universities, and of the CEPES Advisory Committee. Professor C. Warbrick from Durham University and Professor M. Malitza, Director of the European Center for Culture of Bucharest were elected as rapporteurs of the Conference.

Key-note speeches were delivered, in the first plenary meeting, by Professor V.N. Constantinescu; Professor J. Thorens; Professor C.G. Andrén, former Chancellor of the Swedish Universities and Chairman of the Raoul Wallenberg Institute; and Professor Ruud de Moor, former President of

the University of Tilburg and former Member of the CEPES Advisory Committee.

This plenary meeting was followed by the sessions of the three working groups of the Conference, the reports of which were read at the concluding plenary session by their respective *rapporteurs:* Professor Clark Brundin for Working Group I; Professor Frans van Vught for Working Group II; and Professor Frank Newman for Working Group III.

Following these reports, addresses were delivered by Professor G.E. Palade, Nobel-Prize Winner, University of California at San Diego; Professor W.J. Kamba, President of the I.A.U; and Professor M.A.R. Dias, former rector and Director of the Division of Higher Education and Research of UNESCO.

The conference was attended by 185 participants from 30 countries as well as representatives of organizations, foundations, and research centers on higher education.

The President of Romania, Mr. Ion Iliescu, greeted the participants at a reception which he offered in Sinaia on the 5th of May 1992.

2. The Working Document

The main ideas put forward in the Working Document prepared by CEPES (ED-92/CONF.82/4) were the following:

At a time when democracy is gaining momentum, academic freedom and university autonomy, which are closely linked to democratic processes, need to be strongly asserted for their lasting consolidation into all European societies as well as for their incorporation in the other regions of the world. These rights, which express the ideals of freedom and diversity and are essential requirements for the advancement of knowledge and of humanity, enable the University to proclaim its anticipatory and innovative role in society.

While continuing to act as depositories of the cultural traditions and values which give individual peoples their individual identities, European universities must increasingly lend support to those processes aiming at building a united Europe, by emphasizing and cultivating common values and characteristics favouring unity, while also asserting their universal vocation. More than ever, the European conscience and world-wide solidarity are called upon to condemn those tendencies in human society leading to fragmentation and to unending conflict.

Academic freedom and university autonomy guarantee the preservation of that climate required for the search for truth and new knowledge. Due to its central position in a world which claims to be a world of knowledge, the university is confronted with unusual rhythms of knowledge

advancement and with increased competitiveness with regard to its rapid application.

Autonomy is a characteristic of the decision-making process. Each university should make its own decisions on matters related to knowledge, research, and teaching, and place its own coherent strategy on the continuum of axes which are defined by polarities: small dimensions and large ones, general education and specialization, different levels of professionalism and formalism, research and teaching, tradition and innovation, openness and confinement, orthodoxy and a critical attitude.

From among the various constraints that set the parameters of the decision-making capacity of universities, the main problems requiring intelligent and flexible solutions are the harmonization of university policies with the general policies of the public authorities and the management of limited resources.

If it is possible for autonomy to be asserted with the aid of international legal instruments, then it is all the more urgent that it be manifested through inter-institutional activities and co-operation which strengthen it. The moment has come to experiment with new forms of such activities which would help European universities find new partners and sponsors. They should also combine their resources in order to facilitate industrial and social applications rapidly, efficiently, and economically.

Internationalization, among various possible means, provides the university with solid support in the achievement of its own objectives. By working together, universities will be able to increase their proactive capacities. Instead of changing under the impact of events (as during the second half of the XXth century), the universities should be able to take the lead, influencing the course of events in favour of a world of liberty, democracy, justice, and well-being.

II. KEY-NOTE SPEECHES

The **key-note speeches** made during the International Conference on **Academic Freedom and University Autonomy** emphasized that the pace and the depth of change in the world today will have profound effects on universities regardless of their various traditions and structures and of the individual threats and challenges which they are facing. Neither the ways in which the various institutions set their research agendas nor the procedures by which they select their students will remain unaffected. If the universities insist on retaining concepts of autonomy and academic freedom which do not permit an accommodation with external forces, they will find themselves marginalized, as public and private bodies have research done elsewhere, and as students choose other types of institutions in which

to obtain the education they desire. On the other hand, however, if the universities submit to every demand made upon them, if they give in to every passing political whim or student fancy, they will surrender the very characteristics which have made them distinct and worthwhile.

The first danger to be avoided comes from defining university autonomy or academic freedom too widely. A second danger arises from claiming that the characteristics of a particular university or of a particular national university system form the model upon which all European universities and university systems must be based.

University autonomy requires a considerable degree of independence with regard to the internal decision-making processes of individual institutions, but it cannot amount to a demand that the State fund whatever activities institutions wish to undertake at whatever levels they choose. Indeed, for the universities of western Europe, a most significant change in the attitudes of the public authorities has been their recently expressed unwillingness to continue unquestioned and unsupervised financing of higher education.

The funding of universities has come under scrutiny from two points of view. Its overall level has been set against the demands which have been made for resources to support the achievement of other public goals such as advances in health care and welfare. At the same time, the efficiency with which the university spends the public funds which it receives has come under scrutiny. The results in both cases, and regardless of variations in particular situations, have led to the narrrowing of the research base, leading to greater institutional specialization, and a decline in the quality of teaching. I was suggested that the universities will be able to cope with this new situation only if they can improve the effectiveness of their administrative systems through the introduction of mechanisms of quality control across the range of their activities. Although Professor Mayor, the Director-General of UNESCO, declared that the demands for relevance and quality will continue to be made with increasing insistence, Professor de Moor cautioned that it might not be possible to meet these demands without sacrificing the essential quality of internal autonomy. The universities must themselves determine how they are to be effectively administered, giving a sufficient account of themselves to their paymasters while retaining the confidence of their staffs with regard to the fairness of the procedures which they adopt. Moreover, Professor de Moor argued, that it is in the public interest that large areas of discretion be left to the universities, the professionalism of which must be relied upon for the making of appointments, the selection of students, and within the limits of their budgets, decisions as to what research should be conducted and by whom. In these and in other measures, however, there is room for variations in the details of the autonomy of specific universities.

Professor Thorens drew attention to the different ways university rectors are selected, noting that the potential for political influence in the selection process is greater in some systems than in others.

A matter in regard to which universities are facing a common situation concerns the management of the expansion of student enrollments, including students from increasingly diverse backgrounds. Whether this expansion of student numbers and the ensuing diversity of student contingents results from the exercise of constitutional rights, as in Germany, or is the result of government policy as in United Kingdom, the resulting situation is tending to diminish the value and the utility of the élite teaching university as an acceptable form of public institution. However much one might insist on the connection between research and teaching, a shift in the proportion of time devoted to both activities in favour of the latter is in store for many lecturers. One of the tasks of the universities is to continue offering the possibility of recognizable academic careers, including sufficient teaching of high quality, so as to maintain academic standards and to ensure that the so-called "right of higher education" does not become for many would-be-students an empty promise. For Professor Mayor, not only should the course structures be far more flexible so as to meet both student demands and the demands of society at large for expertise, but, the universities should inculcate in graduates an entrepreneurial attitude, making those who do not stay in the academy aware of their duty to use their skills for the creation of wealth. Although this latter obligation cannot be focussed entirely on the universities, they must take this task into consideration as part of their reciprocal obligations to the societies which provide their resources.

What does academic freedom signify? Both Professor Thorens and Professor Andrén traced the idea back to its medieval origins. Although the concept is closely linked to that of university autonomy, the two concepts are distinct. Academic freedom connotes the freedom of academic staff members from outside interference with regard to the selection of research topics and the publication of the results of the research in question. It also connotes the right to establish the curricula according to which the students will be given instruction.

Once again, however, neither concept is absolute. Research must be conducted according to plans established by universities in the exercise of their autonomy in the light of their resources. It must be conducted according to the standards of competence generally recognized in its field, and it must be successful so far as an impartial evaluation is concerned in order to merit publication. Although the matter was not discussed at great length, society may place certain restrictions on research topics (for instance, embryo experimentation) and research methods (for instance,

testing on alive animals). Universities do not have any particular right to be exempt from these restrictions.

The main value of academic freedom is that it is the only way to obtain disinterested but thorough accumulations of knowledge and the elaboration of objective explanations for natural and social phenomena. The State plays a role of patron because it can be (but does not have to be) beyond sectional interest. If it attempts to "steer" the results of research, it destroys the very justification for its patronage. Here, in fact, we are approaching an absolute: the identification of the conditions which make university - based research distinctively valuable.

The feature of academic freedom which distinguishes it from university autonomy is that the former may be invoked by a staff member against his own institution or against his colleagues. While universities may not be perfect democracies, they are called upon to practice that major democratic value, tolerance, as are also their staffs and students. The otherwise competent work of university staff members ought not to be the object of interference, directly or indirectly, simply because the institution as such, or some members of it, take exception to the content of the work in question. Academics, who claim the right of special tolerance with regard to the outside world, must extend the same tolerance to their colleagues.

However good the case for preserving the central aspects of autonomy and academic freedom, so that the university will remain a recognizable vision of itself; however convincing the argument may be that the public interest and not simply the sectorial interest of the university staff itself is thereby furthered, the reality is that both ideals are the objects of threats from various sources, some being the new outcomes of forces which are not yet completely spent.

As a solution to the problem, Professor Constantinescu proposed a series of "compacts" adjusted to the particularities of each university system: a "social compact" to regulate relations within the institution; a "political compact" between the universities and the public authorities; and a "solidarity compact" between the universities of western and eastern Europe, a particularly important component of which would be an understanding by western European universities not to "poach" academic staff from the East but instead to provide training and exchange opportunities for colleagues from the universities in the countries concerned who would perform crucial tasks with regard to the restoration and restructuring of university programmes in their countries. The asymmetry of this latter proposal is founded on the strong moral basis of university collegiality which has been a feature of the European university system and which is making particularly strong calls on western European universities at this time. Professor Mayor spoke to the same effect and mentioned various practical steps which UNESCO was taking in this area. The remarks of

both Professors Constantinescu and Mayor are reminders that the dangers to universities are not all of the same order nor coming from the same directions. Although the principles for which academics argue are of universal significance and of elevated moral value, all academics should be aware of the different consequences for those who are in relatively prosperous and unthreatened circumstances and for those who are not.

It is a short step from such considerations to asking whether autonomy and academic freedom should not be protected at the international level.

Professor Thorens drew the analogy between the guarantee made by Emperor Frederick Barbarossa to the University of Bologna with regard to interference by the Church and the local secular powers and the prospect of an international guarantee against an overweening state. One might look to UNESCO to identify violations of the rights of universities by states. Progress might be made towards a universal standard of university rights, relying at a minimum on the "Magna Carta of European Universities" of CRE and the "Lima Declaration on Academic Freedom and Autonomy of Institutions of Higher Education" of World University Service (WUS). Reference could be made to other documents: the "Declaration on Rights and Duties Inherent in Academic Freedom" of the International Association of University Professors and Lecturers (IAUPL), the "Kampala Declaration on Intellectual Freedom and Social Responsibility" of the Conseil pour le Développement et la Recherche Economique en Afrique (CODESRIA), and the "Dar-es-Salaam Declaration on Academic Freedom and the Social Responsibility of Academics". Certainly the international organizations should be involved. In addition to Professor Mayor's statement of the position of UNESCO, Mr. Maitland Stobart explained the range of concerns in this area of the Council of Europe. Not the least among them is its responsibility for the European Convention on Human Rights, some of the provisions of which are of direct application to academic freedom and all of which are protected by active and accessible machinery.

But is the incidental protection of academic freedom through the general instruments of human rights sufficient? Professor Andrén presented an account of the proceedings of the International Seminar held at the Raoul Wallenberg Institute in Lund, Sweden, in March 1992. This seminar recognized the limitations inherent in applying general human rights treaties to academic freedom and concluded that a human right to academic freedom had not yet been recognized. Discussions were held as to whether or not the claims of university teaching staff members, as a sectorial group, could in fact qualify as a human right. The seminar concluded that since the only way to proceed was outside the instruments of orthodox human rights, the formulation of an international agreement on academic freedom was the proper way to proceed. The seminar,

however, recognized that much needs to be accomplished in order to base a practical legal instrument on general ideas of academic freedom. Precision of a kind not needed for normal political discussions would be necessary. Provision would have to be made for conflicts between academic freedom and other rights. As concern was expressed that many of the component parts of the right to academic freedom could not be stated in absolute terms, the circumstances in which a state might limit these rights would have to be explicated in terms which both restricted the scope of the state's power and were amenable to review by some independent body. It was generally agreed that the ultimate goal should be a legally binding international agreement, even though the participants understood that the steps leading to such an agreement would be long and complex.

The participants in the Wallenberg Institute seminar would have been encouraged by the statement of principles made by Professor de Moor which address the practicalities of university government. It is certainly worth mentioning that if such a project were accomplished, it would be valuable not only as a form of direct protection against government, but as an appeal to public opinion within a state. Such an appeal would consist of a reasoned statement of the underpinnings of academic freedom and university autonomy as part of the process of building a constituency of support within the political workings of a state.

III. WORKING GROUP DEBATES

1. Preliminaries

In order to create a framework for a thorough debate oriented towards practical recommendations, the following three Working Groups were created:

> **Working Group I** on "Academic Freedom and the Social Responsibilities of Higher Education", which dealt with the following subtopics:

- Academic freedom: individual; institutional;
- Academic freedom in the framework of human rights: concerns and areas of expression - an old discourse in a new world;
- Academic freedom and:
  - the mass university,
  - the advancement of knowledge,
  - the expression of value judgements and political opinions,
  - loyalty oaths;

- Infringements of academic freedom: types, incidences, agents, consequences;
- Social responsibilities of higher education: why, for whom, to whom, and by whom.

Working Group II on Autonomy - University Perspective and State Perspective, which discussed the following:

- University autonomy: definitions, models, and practices;
- Legal provisions for university autonomy;
- Autonomy versus accountability;
- Intermediate "buffer" institutions between governmental authorities and higher education institutions; types of such institutions, experience acquired with regard to their functioning; trends and developments;
- Autonomy and financing: how relative is autonomy in a shrinking economy?

Working Group III on Higher Education in a Dynamic Democratic Society tackled the following issues:

- The management of higher education institutions;
- Multiple sources of financing of higher education;
- The penetration of market rules into universities: higher education as a commodity and consequences with regard to autonomy and academic freedom;
- The restructuring of higher education in a period of transition to market economy; problems faced and possible solutions;
- The privatization in higher education and the issues of quality assessment (accreditation);
- The critical role of higher education in a pluralist society.

2. Conclusions

WORKING GROUP I : Academic Freedom and the Social Responsibilities of Higher Education

Working Group I, chaired by Professor I. Lonning, Rector of the University of Oslo, was devoted to a discussion of the question of Academic Freedom and the Social Responsibilities of Higher Education. The Bureau of this Working Group included: Professor Kàroly Kocsis, Rector of the Gödöllö University, Professor E. Roca, Vice-Rector of Barcelona University, and Dr. Clark Brundin, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Warwick. The latter served as the rapporteur of the group.

As the papers presented in the Group will be published and the abstracts are contained in the Working Document of the Conference, this report will not recapitulate their contents in any detail. Nevertheless, some of the specific accents of the discussions need to be stressed.

For instance, the problems faced by eastern European universities and academics with regard to academic freedom and the social responsibility of the university were raised. The view held was that universities in this group of countries offered no real feed-back to society and that the freedom of professors had been seriously limited in the past. At present, the reorganization of higher education systems and the restructuring of universities are under way in the central and eastern European countries. One of their most important preoccupations is to achieve international standards of teaching and research.

The social responsibility of higher education institutions in assuring gender equality was discussed at some length. The Universities were called upon to implement the instruments relating to this issue that have been adopted under the aegis of international organizations.

The role of the humanities was underlined in alleviating the economic and technological pressures on society. In this context, the issue of religious education in the double connotation of freedom of religion and freedom from religion was advanced.

Continuing education, which has been one of the responses of the universities to different age groups and to their differing needs in society, was put forward as an additional element of academic freedom.

The relationship between academic freedom and human rights was discussed at some length with regard to the moral and ethical dimension of the former. Agreement was reached that in general academic freedom is not a fundamental human right even if it is derived from fundamental human rights. The conclusion was also reached that although academic

freedom is not necessarily linked to a democratic society, it exists in a democratic society.

Student rights in relation to academic freedom were also evoked in the discussion in connection with the presentation of the draft "Bill on Academic Freedom and the Rights of Academic Communities" as presented by the IUS (International Union of Students). The discussion pointed out that students should respect their obligations and not simply claim their rights.

One participant argued that academic freedom goes beyond the freedom to teach and to publish research; it also grants academics the freedom to freely criticize university presidents and managers. Others considered this use of academic freedom to be dangerous, a freedom that could threaten the status of the teaching staff. Another group, however, stressed that in their countries university teachers have the status of civil servants which protects their positions at universities.

At the end of the sessions, the following conclusions were drawn:

- **Academic Freedom: individual and institutional**

The definition of academic freedom is not a simple task. However, it was considered not to lie directly within the purview of human rights, which include freedom, but to be derived from them. A question raised was whether or not academic freedom differs from freedom in general and if so, in what respect. The discussions pointed out that academic freedom should be closely linked to the university thus constituting a precondition for the existence of the latter. The participants further stressed that academic freedom is not only a right but also an obligation. Academic freedom cannot survive without a sense of moral obligation.

Academic freedom was approached as both an individual and an institutional right. In the sense that the function of the institution (university) with regard to society was considered, society was conceived of both as the social community and as something more universal - humankind itself.

At the same time, academic freedom, which is linked to the individual, was designated as the right and obligation of every individual. Furthermore, the notion of individual rights relates to all the members of the academic community in terms of specific rights determined by the status which university teachers, students, and university administrators hold.

A tension, however, exists between individual freedom and institutional freedom, but this tension is resolved by the existence of the political authorities which can sometimes be powerful adversaries. This consideration leads to a further consideration, that of the relationship between the university and the state (public authorities).

Although it is the duty of the university to scrutinize and to criticize the state (government), feedback is very important. Academic power is closely linked to economic power.

Academic freedom was also discussed in relation to:

a) *The mass university.* It remained unclear as to whether or not this term referred to a single institution or to the promotion of higher education for a large portion of society. In the first case, however, the conclusion was reached that the mass university can constitute a threat to academic freedom if resources are limited. On the other hand, if well planned, it can contribute to academic freedom by providing flexibility and diversity in the transmission of knowledge. Massification, however, can also represent a negative factor for students, causing them to lose their sense of personal responsibility because they may come to feel that they constitute only a number in the mass.

b) *The advancement of knowledge.* Academic Freedom is a precondition for the advancement of knowledge. The quality of the advancement of knowledge is interdependent with the level of academic freedom.

c) *Value judgements and political opinions.* Although the right to be politically active was considered to be a human right, the general principle that research and teaching are not to be used for political purposes or for the delivery of a political message was underlined. Value judgements are subject to the same constraint in that the personal nature of a judgement must be made clear. However, a question was raised as to whether or not there were any kinds of judgements that were not value judgement. The conclusion was reached that value judgements needed arguments and should be open to criticism.

d) *Loyalty oaths.* Several examples of loyalty oaths were presented. Note was taken of the fact that whether or not obligations were formalized as oaths, they were inherent to each member of the academic community.

- **Social Responsibilities of Higher Education**

The question of the Social Responsibilities of Higher Education was discussed, these responsibilities being viewed in a number of different contexts. On one hand, the responsibility of higher education institutions in meeting the demands of society at large was stressed. This responsibility was also evoked with regard to meeting the demands of different age groups through continuing education, by including the gender issue, by implementing international instruments in staff structures, and by addressing the needs of ethnic minorities and marginal social groups.

The idea of the university as a public service of benefit to society was advanced.

The process of negotiating with different groups in society was underlined, these groups to include social organizations and economic entities within society, and not to be limited to political authorities. A kind of contract must link the government and universities.

The political authorities give proof of their responsibility for education in society by providing material resources for higher education and research. In this context, academic freedom is a form of feedback from the university.

The limits to the power of both the academic community and the political authorities were also discussed.

WORKING GROUP II: Autonomy: University Perspective - State Perspective

Working Group II was convened both on May 5 and May 6, 1992. The bureau of the Working Group consisted of Professors Pierre Cornillot, Marian Papahagi, Leland C. Barrows, and Frans van Vught, the last-mentioned serving as *rapporteur*. Professors Cornillot and van Vught each chaired two sessions of the Working Group.

During the first session of the Working Group, Professor van Vught suggested that the presentation of the papers and the ensuing discussions focus on the contents of the key-note addresses and that these should be developed further and illustrated. He suggested that the following topics be explored:

1. the contents of crucial concepts, especially autonomy, accountability, and responsibility;
2. the differentiation of these concepts; especially distinctions that could be helpful for exploring the various dimensions of the concepts;
3. the relationships between government and higher education institutions;
4. the relationships between autonomy and quality assessment;
5. the relationships between autonomy and funding;
6. the roles and functions of buffer organizations (intermediary organizations);

7. the consequences of the use of the concepts: 'autonomy' and 'accountability' for the administration and management of higher education institutions.

During the sessions of the Working Group, the following papers were presented:

- Robert Berdahl, "Public Universities and State Governments: Is the Tension Benign?"
- Branimir Djordjevic, "Autonomy Perspective and State Perspective".
- Ivan Ivic and Djordje Paunovic, "L'Autonomie de l'Université: un concept ancien et des significations nouvelles".

In addition to these papers, there were several presentations by members of the Working Group on the situations (in terms of autonomy and accountability) in their respective countries.

The papers and presentations were very useful for the group discussions. The Working Group discussed the many topics that were presented and drew conclusions using perspectives that were developed during the discussions.

The Working Group agreed upon the following points:

1. **Autonomy** is a concept which is frequently used in the context of higher education, but which is not often closely defined. Taken simply, autonomy can be defined as the power of a higher education institution to govern itself without outside control. But the concept of 'autonomy' is more complicated than that.

First, autonomy has to be distinguished from **academic freedom**. The academic freedom of individual scholars is their freedom to pursue truth in teaching and research activities wherever it seems to lead, without fear of punishment of termination of employment for having offended some political, religious, or social orthodoxy (E. Ashby, 1966). Academic freedom is a privilege of university teachers and/or researchers. Academic freedom is also a condition that does not vary: it either exists or it does not exist. As a concept, autonomy has to be distinguished from academic freedom. It may be that academic freedom is best protected in an institution enjoying a great deal of autonomy. But this is not necessarily so. Academic freedom may also be guaranteed by a government organisation which nevertheless imposes a heavy set of controls on a higher education institution.

Autonomy is also a concept which permits variation. The autonomy of a higher education institution can vary depending on local conditions and

circumstances. The autonomy of a higher education institution can also vary in time.

Autonomy can be differentiated using the distinction between *'substantive'* and *'procedural'* autonomy. Substantive autonomy is the power of a higher education institution to determine its own goals and programmes (the 'what' of academe). Procedural autonomy is the power of a higher education institution to determine the means by which its goals and programmes will be pursued (the 'how' of academe).

Another differentiation with respect to the concept of autonomy is a distinction of three levels of autonomy:

- *intra-institutional* autonomy, i.e., the autonomy of units within an institution;
- *institutional* autonomy, i.e., the autonomy of a higher education institution as a whole;
- *collective* autonomy, i.e., the autonomy of a group of higher education institutions (regionally, nationally, and internationally).

Autonomy should not be perceived as full independence from outside control. Rather it should be seen as a position enabling higher education institutions and higher education systems to communicate and to negotiate effectively with society.

The concept of autonomy, on the one hand, points to the important dimension of internal democracy in higher education institutions. On the other hand, it points to the creation of intermediary organizations (which of course can vary from country to country).

Directly related to the concept of autonomy is the concept of responsibility. Higher education institutions that enjoy autonomy have to realize that they must accept responsibility for fulfilling certain social functions. These functions, of course, have to do with the place of knowledge in society, i.e., the advancement, conservation, application, and dissemination of knowledge.

The relationship between the concepts of autonomy and of responsibility requires the creation of evaluation systems acting in terms of quality and relevance. Only through the creation of such evaluation systems can the social isolation of higher education institutions be avoided.

It appears that the autonomy of higher education institutions is increasing in many countries both in central and eastern Europe and in western Europe.

2. The relationships between higher education and government in the context of autonomy leads to the need to establish an **interface** between governments and higher education institutions. This interface will, in

organizational terms, consist of one or more buffer organizations. In terms of functions, it can include the evaluation of quality and relevance and the allocation of financial resources.

The establishment of an interface between government and higher education institutions gives rise to specific **ethical, technical,** and **financial** problems.

The group explored these three categories of problems.

3. Regarding **ethical** problems, it is especially important to realize that in a democratic state intermediary organizations cannot assume functions of political responsibility. Intermediary organizations may be very effective mechanisms for communication and negotiation between government and higher education institutions. They cannot, however, be political decision-making bodies.

4. Regarding the **technical** problems related to the establishment of interfaces between governments and higher education institutions, the creation of the evaluation function needs particular attention. With respect to the function of evaluation (in terms of quality and relevance), a number of mechanisms are important: self-evaluation by higher education institutions, peer review and visits by teams of peers, the organization of accreditation bodies, and the formulation of accreditation standards. In the establishment of evaluations, quality assessment should be taken into account. The internal academic dimension is related to the showing of responsibility and accountability to society.

A crucial point in this respect concerns the role of government in evaluation systems. In higher education, this role should be limited to one of *'meta-evaluation', i.e., monitoring only whether or not evaluation systems are being set up and operated according to their objectives.*

The Working Group noted that the evaluation of quality and relevance is a crucial topic that deserves further discussion in the years to come.

5. Regarding **financial** problems, mention was made of the fact that frequently an increase of autonomy for higher education institutions appears to be related to a decrease in financial support. It is important to understand that autonomy is a concept that, as such, does not offer any indication for decisions with regard to the level of funding of higher education.

Also, the Working Group felt strongly that the outcomes of evaluation processes (in terms of quality and relevance) should not be related directly to funding decisions regarding higher education. Rather, these decisions should be based on a combination of base-funding and output-funding. As far as positive and negative incentives can be coupled to the outcomes of evaluation processes, they should be very limited in relation to the total budget of a higher education institution.

6. The Working Group felt that an increase in the autonomy of higher education institutions (and the related need to establish an evaluation system) leads to specific problems with respect to the *administration and the management* of higher education institutions.It especially focuses attention on the ways the internal decision-making processes are organized and on the need to develop strategic management approaches. For both these issues, further study and discussion will be necessary in order to allow higher education institutions to develop administrative and managerial approaches that fit the new conditions of increased autonomy.

Finally, the Working Group concluded that two studies would be very useful to further the discussion on the organization of autonomy of higher education institutions. One should be a comparative analysis of the existing declarations on academic freedom and autonomy with the objective of formulating a set of generally acceptable principles and conditions. The other study should be an international comparative analysis of the role and functions of various types of buffer organizations in higher education systems in order to permit the establishment of an inventory of the successes and failures of such organizations.

The Working Group concluded that the points mentioned above are of great importance for the development of higher education systems and institutions in the near future. The group particularly emphasized the importance of the combination of autonomy and of responsibility to society, and as a consequence of the need to develop an effective interface between higher education institutions and government. The establishment of one or more buffer organizations and the creation of evaluation systems are crucial steps that should be taken in building up this interface.

WORKING GROUP III: Higher Education in a Dynamic Democratic Society

The bureau of Working Group III included Professors Ergün Togrol, Stanislav Hanzl, Frank Newman, and Guy Neave. Professor Ergün Togrol acted as chairman and Professor Frank Newman as rapporteur. The group received an important guideline for its work from the Director-General, who in his opening address to the Conference, had noted as follows:

"The accountability of the university is ultimately no different from that of any other social actor: it must demonstrate the relevance of its role to social needs and the effectiveness with which it performs that role. Its function in this context is not something determined once and for all. It has a heredity, rooted in freedom of enquiry, but this heredity must be expressed in interaction with an ever-changing social environment."

World-wide economic restructuring has taken place in the past twenty years with significant implications for national university systems. Increased competition among the industrialized countries has forced enterprises to reorganize themselves in order to be more competitive.

With this in mind, Working Group III focussed on the more specific modes of restructuring the university to meet this challenge.

Developments

The Group discussed many of the developments which are changing the conditions within which the university must now operate. Universities everywhere are becoming more international. This situation leads to great advantages, but it also means that universities will find themselves increasingly competing with one another. As is already true for industry, each institution must find ways to improve in order to stay at the forefront. We should not, in thinking about this new climate, underestimate the capacities of many central and eastern European universities.

Universities also face a new world of greater emphasis on market forces. With the resulting stress on flexibility and openness, universities have the opportunity to reinforce their traditional autonomy. But there are also problems.

In some places, market forces have led to the privatization of parts of the system. In England and Romania, large numbers of private universities have been established. In Italy, corporations have begun to support university research. In eastern and central Europe, the universities were controlled by national planning departments which have now disappeared. New modes of state-university interrelation are needed.

But, in addition to these factors, broader trends are making the role of universities more critical in all societies. In a world of increasingly intensified international competition, a far larger part of the population must be well educated. Therefore, we are likely to see the need for mass higher education everywhere. Bringing this about is a difficult task, not easily accomplished.

As societies become more pluralistic and less homogeneous, it should be more important as well as easier for the university to be a source of critical thinking. The university should use this opportunity to contribute to shaping the future of society. To do so, it must use itself as a channel of communication to the public.

Research and new ideas, already important, will become more so in all countries.

New Forms of Accountability

The changing nature of society and the changing nature of the university call for new forms of accountability. Many universities have become huge enterprises in themselves. The rise in the number of universities and their growing complexity increase the difficulties involved in making them accountable.

At the same time, the state is increasingly asking for evidence of performance in return for any added funding. Some evidence already exists that the level of funding of universities and departments within universities varies greatly but without much evidence that this variation is correlated with quality.

How, then, do we achieve greater accountability and greater autonomy and flexibility? Can market forces and competition be used? If so, how? In answering this question, we must remember the differences in tradition between North America and Europe. The same approaches may not work everywhere in the world. One thing is clear, we need a better process by which the performance of universities is assessed.

The Background of the Question of Social Economy versus Market Economy

One factor which will affect how states fund and hold accountable their universities is the differing traditions of Europe and North America. In Europe, the state assumes the obligation of the cost of attending the university as a social obligation. In North America, it is assumed that this cost should be shared with students (and their families).

In countries in which universities were almost entirely public, this change will likely mean a greater privatization of universities. But at the same time that market forces are increasing, the state may be increasing its influence over what universities do and how they do it by attempting to renovate and expand the innovation system, including reshaping research and training at universities.

The Influence of Market Forces

What changes in the universities have been brought about as a result of the shift toward market forces? One result has been the need to "produce a more marketable product", i.e., a student more suited to the new needs of the market economy. This task requires an improved feedback from industry.

Another effect is the intensified interest in having the university play an expanded role in regional development, an aspect of which is technology transfer. Another effect is the role of university graduates as transmitters

of new knowledge. For these to be as effective as possible, international co-operation and research is essential.

One would also hope that the university would play a large role in the significant changes taking place in society beyond the economy. It is not clear that universities have begun to play a major role in helping to reshape the new society. Rather, the university still seems to be in a more reactive mode.

One possible danger may be that in the more fluid circumstan market forces will cause universities to reduce or close some of thei departments. Such a situation could pose a risk to unpopular departments or even unpopular faculty members, potentially creating a new problem of autonomy.

The rise of market forces thus raises fundamental questions of responsibility. Who should pay for education, the state or the consumer? How, in other words, is education to be subsidized? Who should pay for research? Fundamental research has a long time constant. So does education. Market forces tend to have shorter time constants. How can these contradictions be reconciled?

Short-run effects may also damage the university. The brain drain from the university to the private sector or from eastern and central Europe to the West may be the most damaging. In the long run, these forces will help reorient the university, but can they be mitigated in the short run?

Another danger is that market forces will cause universities to homogenize. Is it the state's responsibility to define and preserve the mission of the university?

Despite the potential drawbacks of the effects of the market economy on the university system, there is no doubt that a market economy increases its flexibility. Furthermore, it may have a positive effect in the performance of universities by encouraging productive competition among institutions.

Leadership

Changes in society and in the university require different types of and stronger leadership. Whereas in the past, a management was needed that could deal with a stable and familiar form of university governance, today the university must be dynamic. It must continue to change. It must be flexible and adaptable. It must have the skill to encourage change in the departments, to support the taking of risks, to plan in strategic terms, to negotiate with the state, and to co-operate with an array of other organizations and constituencies.

The task of leadership must now be seen in a new light. It must include vision, the creation of an appropriate climate, and the involvement of

important constituencies (including the state, the faculty, and the students). It requires both strong leadership and skilled management. These qualities are not antithetical. But university leaders must be interested in, knowledgeable about, and involved in the issues of society such as social change and economic development.

All these tasks require strong rectors and deans. They also require a great deal of faculty initiative, but this must be constructive faculty initiative. The situation calls for a strong central administration, one that is flexible, open, and consultative.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The following are more specific conclusions and recommendations:

1. The most relevant approach to reshaping university governance to meet the new conditions is not likely to be either the traditional internally oriented governance model or a fully market driven model. Rather it is likely to be a new system that adapts the best of the two systems.
2. The primary objective of joint ventures with the newly democratic countries should be capacity building.
3. Comparative research is needed on these issues both at micro- and macro-levels. At the macro-level, this research should include such subjects as research on emerging models of governance and accountability. At the micro-level, research might address changes in specific curricula or the use of new technologies, etc.
4. Better East-West co-operation is needed. One approach would be to create institutes in central and eastern Europe focussed on training leaders for higher education. Training should be at both the macro- and micro-levels. Such institutes should have close links with similar institutions in western Europe and North America and to international organizations. Another approach would be to create specific, standing consortia of universities for an ongoing East-West dialogue.
5. Expand what is already working. European and American exchange agreements, UNESCO projects and other projects including the European Communities, OECD, etc., exist. Many of the exchange agreements need government funding to supplement private and university funding in order to reach an appropriate scale. Expand existing modes of dissemination as well.
6. Where privatization of universities is occurring, new forms of quality assurance are needed. These might include:
   - voluntary accreditation;
   - a requirement for the chartering or the licensing of institutions;

- a system of external review;
- the reporting to the public of measures of quality such as graduation rates and student performance rates.

7. Insure a focus on teaching and learning in a pluralistic society. This will require new approaches to teaching and learning. There is already a CEPES project that can be utilized as it is focussed on staff development.
8. Develop new approaches to the use of technologies. These might include teleconferencing and computer linkages to supplement East-West meetings and to speed the exchange of ideas. New technologies can also speed dissemination of materials, supplement faculty exchanges, etc.
9. Preserve the connection with both western Europe and North America. With the growing significance of European co-operation and the emergence of North American co-operative efforts, two dangers should be avoided: first, the development of competing and unconnected blocs rather than a broad, intercontinental co-operation effort; second, the degeneration, once established, of large co-operative efforts into bureaucratic endeavours that shut off the opportunity for flexibility and experimentation at the campus level.

IV. THE CLOSING SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE

The closing session of the conference, a plenary session, took place on Thursday May 7th. It was addressed by Professors G. Palade, Nobel Prize Winner of the University of California at San Diego; Professor W. Kamba, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Harare, Zimbabwe, President of the International Association of Universities; Professor A. Chelkowski, Speaker of the Polish Senate; and Professor M. A. R. Dias, Director at UNESCO of the Division of Higher Education and the Training of Educational Personnel (ED/HEP).

In his speech, Professor Palade gave a historical overview of the American Higher Education System considering that this approach would best illustrate the evolution of the principles and meanings attached to academic freedom and important phases in the evolution of the institutions of higher education in the United States: the American undergraduate college, the American university, and the American research-intensive university. Academic freedom and university autonomy have evolved continuously but at varied rates ever since the foundation early in the 17th century of the first institutions of higher learning on North American soil.

Professor Palade considered that the basic traits of this evolution consist of the following: i) adaptability, sometimes delayed and sometimes

reluctant but none-the-less efficient; ii) lack of imposed conformity, in fact, at times, a bewildering variety; iii) a pluralistic support system which amounts to tapping whatever resources become available; iv) polymorphism in size and scope due in large measure to the grafting of new forms on pre-existing ones: the German university on the American college and the research-intensive university on the American university, while the pre-existing forms, colleges and universities, continue an active existence; and v) a late awakening to the principles of academic freedom and university autonomy which, with rare exceptions, have been reasonably well respected and defended. According to Professor Palade's view, the problem to be resolved in the near future is to what extent these principles have to be adapted to the new climate of intensive interactions between academia and the private sector (the business world).

Professor Walter Kamba, in his speech, emphasized the universality of the university insisting that it be free of any traces of tribalism, national chauvinism, racism, sexism, or any other differences artificially induced in order to negatively affect the basic principles of the academic world. Academic freedom and university autonomy may take historically different shapes and meanings, bringing to the fore certain organizational structures, curricula, teacher-student relationships, and certain connections between universities and the outside world; however, the principles as such must remain valid over time. The adaptability of universities, focussed on quality and academic co-operation throughout the world, may seem to be the crucial message of history. For this very reason, universities should look for those principles and meanings of academic freedom and university autonomy which will preserve the basic functions with which they are entrusted by society while enhancing their contributions to the promotion of knowledge and expertise in society at large.

Professor A. Chelkowski referred to the experiences of the Polish higher education system in the transitional period from dictatorship to democracy and a social market economy with which Polish society, as well as other eastern and central European societies, are faced. Academic freedom and university autonomy are considered as crucial options to be chosen in order to further both the democratization of academic institutions and of societies at large. For this reason, in the case of Poland, new laws on higher education are envisaged or have been passed so as to juridically preserve the basic provisions of academic freedom and university autonomy. The relationships between governmental authorities and academic staffs are to be based on common grounds and interests for developing co-operation and avoiding any sources of confrontation. Universities are called upon to play an important role in the process of democratization of society while developing their own ways of functioning democratically.

Following these three addresses, the chairmen of the bureaux of the working groups presented the conclusions and recommendations of the debates which had taken place in their respective groups. The participants appreciated the richness of the work accomplished and approved the reports while emphasizing the need to follow-up the proceedings of the conference. The decision was taken to distribute the final report widely and to publish a volume in which the various papers would be featured.

Following the approval of the reports of the working groups, Professor Dias delivered the closing address of the Conference. He began by stressing that the conference had been a very great success as proved by the high level of the papers which were presented, by the richness of the debates which took place in the working groups, by the large representation of almost all the European countries along with North America (Canada and the USA), and by the interest shown by international governmental and non-governmental organizations. Professor Dias particularly commended the efforts made by the Romanian authorities to ensure the success of the conference.

Professor Dias continued by emphasizing the ways in which the Sinaia Conference had underlined the importance of the twin concepts of academic freedom (the freedom to teach and to undertake research regardless of whether or not the results offend established orthodoxies) and of university autonomy (a concept which includes various conceptions of institutional freedom and the right to raise funds autonomously and to practice academic freedom). Professor Dias evoked the words of an earlier speaker, Professor Justin Thorens, particularly his recommendation that oscillations, back and forth, from authoritarianism to anarchy be avoided, a sure path between these extremes being preferred. The university must not forget that the justification for its autonomy can only exist within its mission which itself is linked to its social utility.

Professor Dias reminded the participants that the Sinaia Conference was organized along with a series of meetings and studies which UNESCO has been promoting over the last two years on tendencies in and challenges to contemporary higher education on the eve of the 2lst century. Currently UNESCO is preparing a major written synthesis on these questions. It is also preparing a study on the possibility of elaborating an international instrument on the status of teaching personnel.Professor Dias additionally described the inception and the current realizations of the UNITWIN and UNESCO Chairs schemes of UNESCO. The former is intended to support the latter in giving new impulsions to the twinning of universities, paticularly in north-south and east-west directions, in supporting existing inter-regional networks and supporting the creation of new ones, and in creating or reinforcing centres for research and specialized studies through their involvement in the UNESCO Chairs scheme. Some 40

north-south projects are now in operation. As a support to democracy and liberty in education, UNESCO is preparing to hold a major conference in Tunis in December 1992 on "Education for Democracy". It will address the questions of academic freedom and university autonomy.

The participants were cautioned against certain trends considered dangerous for the future of higher education, particularly a tendency on the part of the public authorities in many of the member countries of the region to relinquish responibility for higher education to a greater or lesser extent through sometimes excessive privatization and/or its partitioning into excessively small units.

Professor Dias praised the role of CEPES over the twenty years of its existence particularly expressing his appreciation to the Romanian local staff, of which two members have served at CEPES since its founding, and thanking the Center for its efforts in preparing the Sinaia Conference. He also described the recommendations which were going to be made to the Executive Board of Unesco in its May, 1992, meeting, that CEPES be reinforced and be converted into an inter-agency center for higher education in Europe to which would be added certain worldwide responsibilities. Thus CEPES, which is called upon to collaborate closely with the UNITWIN and the UNESCO Chairs schemes will play a major role in higher education in the world. Evoking the celebration by UNESCO of the 500th anniversary of the "encounter of civilizations", Professor Dias concluded his address with a quotation taken from a declaration made by a former Brazilian Minister of Education: 'University rhymes with liberty'.

V. ADOPTION OF THE "SINAIA STATEMENT"

At the end of the Conference, Professor V.N. Constantinescu presented to the participants the draft of the "Sinaia Statement", prepared by the Bureau of the Conference after consultations with various representatives of the Working Groups. A discussion of the Statement took place, some suggestions were made, and finally the Statement was adopted (see page 4).

ROUND-TABLE ON THE UNESCO STUDY CONCERNING THE STATUS OF HIGHER EDUCATION TEACHING PERSONNEL

The Round-Table held to discuss the 'UNESCO Study Concerning the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel' was attended by 7 participants representing prominent NGO's of the teaching profession as well as UNESCO and ILO. They included the following: Professor Marc-Alain Berberat, Under Secretary-General of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession; Professor Dorothea Gaudart of the Austrian Commission for UNESCO, Member of the CEPES Advisory Committee; Professor Daniel Monteux, Secretary for Higher Education of the World Federation of Teachers' Trade Unions; Mr. Ion Pacuraru of the Ministry of Labour of Romania, Correspondent of the International Labour Organization in Romania; Professor Ramzi Salamé, UNESCO Consultant and Professor at Laval University, Quebec, Canada; Professor Fred Wilson, President of the Canadian Association of University Professors; and Mr. Dimitri Beridze of the Division of Higher Education and the Training of Educational Personnel (ED/HEP) of the UNESCO Secretariat. Professor Fred Wilson, was elected Chairman, and Mr. Dimitri Beridze of the UNESCO Secretariat served as *rapporteur.*

Particular attention was given to Professor R. Salamé's presentation of the working document of the Round Table. Mention should be made that the contribution of Professor Salamé was made possible thanks to a grant given under the joint assistance programme of the Canadian National Commission for UNESCO and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).

All the participants emphasized the urgency of the issue, bearing in mind the increasing importance of higher education in education systems worldwide and the corresponding increase of educational staffs involved in it. The increase in staff has in fact been spectacular involving a doubling if not a tripling over the last 20 years. As a result, there are now 5 million university-level teachers worldwide out of a total of 50 million teachers at all levels of education. On the other hand, the absence of reference to staff members in this sector in the international documents which set the normative standards is becoming more and more anachronistic.

Having examined an orientation paper presented by UNESCO and other pertinent international documentation, the participants gave their support to the efforts being undertaken by UNESCO and urged that they be pursued. They have therefore submitted the following Statement to the

Conference on **Academic Freedom and University Autonomy** (5-7 May 1992, Sinaia, Romania) for its approval:

The Conference appreciates steps so far taken by UNESCO in pursuance of Resolution 1.16 of the 26th Session of its General Conference held in October-November, 1991, in regard to the in-depth study concerning the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel and calls upon the Director-General: firstly, to pursue these efforts according to the established calendar, and, secondly, to invite the ILO to join UNESCO's efforts in this area, by creating an inter-agency working group which will further this action in consultation with the other interested partners, particularly NGO's of the teaching profession, including those of university teachers.

ROUND-TABLE ON "NETWORK: EUROPEAN UNIVERSITIES"

In order to further outline co-operation and support for the "Network: European Universities", CEPES organized a round table, during the Conference, in which representatives of the Council of Europe (Mr. M. Stobart), CRE (Mr. Hans van Ginkel), the American Council on Education (Ms. M. Green), the CEPES Advisory Committee (Mr. G. Leibbrandt), as well as of UNESCO headquarters (Mr. M.A.R. Dias, Mr. D. Chitoran, Mr. D. Beridze), and CEPES staff members (Ms. Carin Berg, Mr. Lazar Vlasceanu, Mr. Oleg Kouptsov) participated. During the discussions, the participants put forward suggestions and ways of action, at the same time evoking certain problems which might be encountered in the process of implementation.

1. Since the adoption, by the General Conference of UNESCO at its 26th Session, of Resolution 1.14 focussed on the development of inter-university co-operation in Europe through a multilateral network entitled "Network: European Universities" within the framework of the UNITWIN project, many new trends have become evident and new developments have taken shape in inter-university European co-operation. Despite the fact that the connotations attached to the concept of the "network" are so diversified that it is sometimes difficult to compare existing academic networks and to draw substantial conclusions, one cannot ignore the rapid involvement of institutional, functional, and disciplinary networks. The participants of the 40th Semestrial Conference of CRE, which was held from 2 to 4 April 1992 in Strasbourg, analyzed the problems and experiences of academic networking and asked the Secretariat of CRE to set up a data base on all the academic networks operating in Europe. CEPES was asked to collaborate with CRE in the elaboration of an inventory of academic networks in Europe, while at the same time collecting other relevant information in the field.

2. The UNITWIN project and the UNESCO chairs scheme offer opportunities for developing new networks or for strengthening of already existing ones. In this respect, CEPES should give particular attention to the following:

   i) The setting up and the strengthening of the newly established UNESCO chairs in Europe, particularly in the universities belonging to the central and eastern European countries. These chairs should become focal points for the networking of European universities north, south, east, and west, and at the same time considered as gateways for co-operation with universities from other regions of the world, particularly from the developing

countries. Particular attention should be given within Europe to those existing or envisaged networks which link universities from the west with those from eastern European countries.

ii) Stimulating the development of those networks focussed on subjects or domains like management, economics, ecology, and environmental protection, European studies, and cultural development. Specific links might be established between academic disciplinary networks and other projects sponsored, co-ordinated, or developed by various foundations or international organizations (particularly the European Communities and the Council of Europe).

iii) The targeting of its activities towards the training of young students and researchers, thus contributing to the development of a young generation of academics.

3. CEPES should pay particular attention to the collection and processing of information on the needs of universities for academic co-operation, for this will enable it to broker services to partners interested in developing various projects based on co-operation.

4. Since the network is going to be financed by extra-budgetary funds, UNESCO should take the necessary measures to contact UNDP and the World Bank in order to prospect available funds for higher education development and co-operation. TEMPUS also offers many opportunities for funding various projects when partners from eastern European universities act on common interests and grounds. CEPES can act as a co-ordinating agency for developing projects of co-operation based on networking.

5. The UNICOM project, which is going to become operational by the end of 1992, enables CEPES to communicate easily with various partners, thus facilitating the building up of data-bases to store and to distribute relevant information for networks. The envisaged meeting of CEPES liaison officers should be dedicated to an analysis of the ways the abovementioned proposals have been implemented and the future steps expected to support the development of the "Network: European Universities".

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND UNIVERSITY AUTONOMY

Working Document

I. Introduction

1. At a time when democracy is gaining momentum, academic freedom and university autonomy, which are closely linked to democratic processes, need to be strongly asserted for their lasting incorporation into all European societies as well as for their consolidation in the other regions of the world.

These rights, which express the ideals of freedom and diversity and are essential requirements for the advancement of knowledge and of humanity, enable the University to proclaim its anticipatory and innovative role in society.

2. Even as universities continue to act as depositories of the cultural traditions and values which give each people its own identity, they must increasingly lend support to those processes aiming at building a united Europe, by emphasizing and cultivating common values and characteristics favouring unity, while also asserting their universal vocation. More than ever, the European conscience and world-wide solidarity are called upon to condemn those tendencies in human society leading to fragmentation and to unending conflict.

3. Academic freedom and university autonomy guarantee the preservation of that climate required for the search for truth and new knowledge. Due to its central position in a world which claims to be a world of knowledge, the university is confronted with unusual rhythms of knowledge advancement and with increased competitiveness with regard to its rapid and economic application, all of which have put many of its traditional methods to the test.

4. Autonomy is a characteristic of the decision-making process. Each university must make its own decisions on matters related to knowledge, research, and teaching, and place its own coherent strategy on the continuum of axes which are defined by polarities: small dimensions and large ones, general education and specialization, different levels of professionalism and formalism, research and teaching, tradition and innovation, openness and confinement, orthodoxy and a critical attitude.

5. From among the various constraints that set the parameters of the decision-making capacity of universities, the main problems requiring intelligent and flexible solutions are the harmonization of university policies with the general policies of the public authorities and the management of limited resources.

6. If it is possible for autonomy to be asserted with the aid of international legal instruments, then it is all the more urgent that it be manifested through inter-institutional activities and co-operation which strengthen it. The moment has come to experiment with new forms of such activities which would help European universities find new partners and sponsors, enabling them to successfully combine their resources in order to facilitate industrial and social applications rapidly, efficiently, and economically.

7. Internationalization, among various possible means, provides the university with solid support in the achievement of its own objectives. The progress made in communications, electronics and computers through the use of networks - with nodes of excellence, of reception, and of communication - is available to everybody. Other ways to facilitate mobility are being examined.

8. By working together, universities would be able to increase their proactive capacities. Instead of changing under the impact of events (as during the second half of the XXth century), the universities would be able to take the lead, influencing the course of events in favour of a world of liberty, democracy, justice, and well-being.

II. Academic Freedom, University Autonomy and Democracy

1. Academic freedom and university autonomy* are closely related to **democracy**. These concepts, the history of which goes back to the emergence of universities in Europe, are discussed today against the favourable background of the progress of democracy on the continent. Not only is western Europe consolidating its democratic processes into new forms of integration and recognition of common standards, but also the states of central and eastern Europe have adhered to and are putting into practice the principles of political pluralism, of fundamental human rights, and of the rule of law. The fact that these states have adhered to the Council of Europe or to its juridical instruments, that they are orienting themselves towards the European Communities, and that they have adopted standards of international conduct in the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe testify to a democratic consensus favourable to the exercise of academic freedom and university autonomy.

2. Although these concepts are both coextensive with the principles and processes of democratic societies, they do not overlap, as some specialists have already pointed out (1), since examples exist of universities with curtailed autonomy which did observe academic freedom (in the XIXth century), as well as of autonomous universities which suppressed academic freedom (as in the Medieval period). Academic freedom being closely linked to intellectual freedom and to other **fundamental rights such as the freedoms of expression, of association, and of thought** is a specific application of these rights to the case of a knowledge-centred profession. Although university autonomy initially evolved from that freedom of association which was recognized by society, it has in recent times forged indissoluble links with the recognition of pluralism and the respect for diversification, characteristic of democratic structures.

3. The favourable background today for academic freedom and university autonomy in no way reduces responsibility for **the assertion of both and their consolidation** in ways which make them irreversible. To begin with, after their decades-long infringement in several central and eastern European countries, these rights are being rediscovered with increased effervescence in those areas where the academic communities wish to reimplant them permanently. The historical change which the end of totalitarianism brought forth over vast areas of Europe, put on the agendas of the countries of this region the question of university autonomy and academic freedom. The understanding and correct application of both could contribute to the solution of some of the manifold and acute problems facing the systems of higher education which train millions of students (2). Secondly, other regions of the world, where these rights cannot be fully asserted, are following this common European development with great interest and hope. Any debate or action at the European university level may thus have consequences on other continents as well.

4. If democracy is a fertile ground for academic freedom and university autonomy, the reverse is also true. These two characteristics of universities have been contagious in society, providing its political culture with valid and inspiring examples. Academic freedom should be regarded not only as an effect of democracy but particularly as **forerunners of freedom in society**. Academic freedom is the beacon towards which the aspirations of many professions are directed, while university autonomy should be considered a forerunner in the process of decentralization and of the delegation of decision-making powers to lower echelons, a phenomenon which is becoming more and more evident these days in management and in the democratic organization of society.

III. The Human Rights Context

5. Higher education in Europe benefits from a **double heritage**. It is the inheritor of the humanistic Enlightenment, placing its faith in emancipation through knowledge and the development of reason, but also of that counter-enlightenment Romanticism, which laid stress on the value of national traditions and cultures. The first heritage involves the human ideal of an absolutely free individuality driven to the bounds of abstraction, with no attachments, the perfect subject of economic liberalism. The second heritage refers to the ideal of individuals who are profoundly attached to national communities, ethnic or religious, having relevant historical pasts and with their own values conferring on them given identities. Today this dichotomy is the object of contentions opposing the two conceptions (3). Some authors bewail the frantic search for identity which is going on in the world of today, blaming it for the resulting fragmentation and for the loss of the universalistic ideal, while others consider that, in a world of cultures. the abstract person is completely obsolete (4).

6. The two viewpoints also apply to the genesis and the development of the concentration of **fundamental human rights**, the first Declaration of which having been written for the individuals of any nation, who receive their rights through reason, directly from nature, without the need for any intermediaries. In such a light, rights can only be individual. But for the inheritors of cultures, rights can also be collective, since the identity-conferring values originate in the group over time.

7. The European university occupies a special place in this debate. From the beginning, it has moulded strong, mobile, and universal individualities, but it has also nurtured both the spirit of brotherhood and the solidarity of the academic community. Seen as a corporation, the university is the only guild which was not abolished by the liberal economy of the XIXth century. The depository of the two heritages, the university has a **special potential for combining individual rights and group solidarity** and for harmonizing the two conceptions of humanity. The university is the ideal place where the fundamental ideas of human rights, freedom, equality in the eyes of the law, rejection of intolerance and racial, ethnical or religious discrimination can be both preached and applied and acquired for life. Those formulae which increase the **interaction** among young people from different groups are liable to have a greater impact on education for human rights, and on the increase of the social role of the university.

8. Given that the beginning of the last decade of our century is a period during which the cultural dimension which underlines differences and specificities is given top priority, it is probably worthwhile recalling the vocation of unity and **universality** which the European university has never

ceased to proclaim. Even if in our days, the hope for a wider European identity is added to the reality of national identity, through explorations of a common history and the search for cultural values shared by all people, the tension between globalism and regionalism will still remain. It is within the university that the ideal of universality in terms of rights, civilization, and worldwide solidarity can best be pursued. The existence of a European Centre like CEPES and of a universal Organization like UNESCO, pursuing the same ideals, is an illustration of this trend.

IV. The Horizon of Knowledge

9. Universities remain modern institutions because the period in which we are living proclaims the central importance of their functions. In the second half of our century, universities have been perfect illustrations of the communication or **age of information**, as their activities could be looked upon as means of communication across generations or, within the international academic community, between scientists. Knowledge has now superseded information as a fundamental concept, and our age proclaims itself an **age of knowledge**. Thus we are giving a new definition of universities as being above all centres for the transmission and production of knowledge. Academic freedom should be examined with respect to and in the light of this essential function.

10. Academic freedom is not merely a corollary of the fundamental rights in a given professional or intellectual field but a *sine qua non* for the **critical transmission of knowledge**. Old ideas and knowledge cannot be taken over without an examination, free of constraints other than the criteria involving the evaluation of truth. On the other hand, new ideas and knowledge do not appear and do not penetrate in a world without free confrontation of ideas. So much historical evidence has been accumulated, that there is no need to demonstrate that results in terms of knowledge will turn up only in a specific climate; the moral, psychological, and methodological requirements of such a climate are expressed through academic freedom. This freedom has become a vital ingredient in the prescription for the social production of knowledge.

11. There is a new element with regard to the transmission and production of knowledge, one which is modifying the classical image of the teachers as well as their academic freedom. This element is the **rapid pace** at which knowledge renews itself. The most rapid changes characterizing major breakthroughs have been recorded in biology, in medicine, in physics, in the computer and information sciences, and in materials engineering. Knowledge, which has a shorter life span than a person's professional life, is changing teaching methods and goals, as well as the life styles of teachers, who used to enjoy a right to detachment, to solitude, and to reflection.

The mass university, the tens of thousands of students, and the thousands of courses make the timetables of teachers more complicated than those of trains. Academic life is agitated by the nervousness, rush, and multiple requests which characterize the lives of ordinary civil servants. The technical equipment of universities requires assistance and maintenance, while the administration requires reports and paperwork. Research is conducted in teams, and contracts involve travel and meetings. The contrast is profound, not only with regard to the peripatetic search for truth in the medieval cloister gardens but also with regard to the serenity of the German university in Hilbert's time, at the beginning of this century.

12. We are now witnessing praiseworthy efforts aimed at codifying academic freedom and the autonomy of higher education institutions. The **Lima Declaration** (5) marks a major accomplishment in the fulfillment of this task. The value of an international document resides in its adoption by the governments, since the recognition of academic freedom by the state is the cornerstone of its consolidation. There are difficulties, however, in codifying academic freedom. It is easy to see that in academic life **unwritten norms of conduct** prevail, elaborated through tradition and acquired through experience. These norms indicate what is permissible and recommendable, as well as what is unacceptable and reproachful, in the conduct of academics and students. The unwritten norms of academic conduct spell out both freedoms and responsibilities, but the emphasis is placed on the latter. Indeed, in the 1980's in many countries, stress was laid on **responsibilities**. Even the idea of drafting a universal declaration on responsibilities was broached (6). Two hundred years ago, however, Tom Paine wrote that there was no need for such a declaration, because each human right could be stated as a freedom or as a responsibility. The academic career, sometimes assimilated to the functions of a missionary, is one of the professions with the highest requirements for responsibility.

V. University Autonomy: A Decision-making Autonomy

13. Autonomy is one of those terms to which various meanings are attached. From one perspective, autonomy is synonymous with the independence of higher education institutions relative to control by the state and by other governing bodies in society. From another perspective, it is the institutional framework for the implementation of academic freedom and the democratic practice of self-government in universities. It is implicit in these stands that autonomy can be viewed either from a negative or a positive perspective. The first includes the denial of any right on the part of the state or of any other political, religious, or ideological body to interfere with university operations and affairs or to impose restrictions on them. As for

the positive perspective, one type of orientation would be the institutional right of a university to fully exercise academic freedom and self-government with regard to its internal activities.

14. Let us further explore the implications of considering the university autonomy as a decision-making autonomy. From this perspective, autonomy involves the right to legislate and to establish rules for a social subsystem, i.e. for an institution of higher education, without any external interference, hierarchical or horizontal, governmental or social, economic or moral. It does not exist as an absolute concept, in the same way as sovereign states cannot legislate contrary to the international responsibilities assumed by them. To make rules means **to make decisions**, and autonomy in fact covers both the daily processes by which its own rules are implemented, and the ways in which problems pertaining to higher education institutions are solved, all of which entail a large number of decisions. As part of the decision-making process, autonomy is present especially in the making of important decisions for higher education and research. The decision-making area can be represented by an axis, and the decision-making act, as a point situated between the extremes. The axes on which the decisions directly connected to the functioning of a higher education institutions are situated are the following:

a) small enrollments - large enrollments;

b) élite education - mass education;

c) person-centred - discipline-centred - job-centred training;

d) general education (directed at producing well-rounded educated persons) - specialist training;

e) the teaching - research ratio;

f) tradition - innovation in the choice of subjects, methods and technologies,

g) rigid order - permissiveness axis;

h) self-confinement - openness (with regard to external institutions and society);

i) formality - informality in terms of courses of study and of relations in institutions of higher education;

j) readiness to accept established truths or an ambience of criticism or even of contestation.

Table 1

Small enrollments	Large enrollments
Élite education	Mass Education
Discipline	
Person-centred ..... Discipline-centred	Job-centred
General	Specialist
Teaching	Research
Traditional	Innovation
Rigid Order	Permissiveness
Self-confinement	Openness
Formality	Informality
Orthodoxy	Heterodoxy

15. To make a decision, in other words, to choose a variant from among a number of possibilities in each of these problem areas, by establishing a ratio or a degree of attention to be given to a particular characteristic, means to devise a **strategy**, the stable maintenance of which for as long as possible gives a **profile** to the respective higher education institution. A large choice of other domains also exists: an institution can put into practice a more or less developed system of bonuses or sanctions. The important thing for a higher education institution is to enjoy as much freedom as possible in making decisions in the domains pertaining to the nature and the quality of teaching, research, and training; that is, on matters directly linked to the fulfilment of its basic function.

16. One can observe that the ten axes which have been selected allow for **significant but not complete correlations**: universities with a small number of enrolled students aim at élite status; the person-centred universities adopt a general education system, while the job-oriented ones strive for specialization. As a rule, the traditionalists like to keep to their restricted circle but are more orderly, whereas the ones in favour of greater social openness almost always invite dissidence. The first column is more closely linked to the classical type of education, while the right-hand one, to the modern type of education. There are also a good number of examples which

prove the contrary: large but élite institutions, traditional institutions promoting informal education, while in other places general education combines with non-conformity. One cannot speak about merits or disadvantages in absolute terms. A certain degree of conservatism is welcome in order to avoid intellectual styles and ideological trends lacking a solid scholarly foundation; on the other hand, a ferment of non-conformity acts as an obstacle to ossification and desuetude. T.S. Eliot wrote that "...The danger of freedom is deliquescence; the danger of strict order is petrification".

17. This overall picture is highly suggestive of the constraints bearing on both fundamental and current strategic decisions. We shall first examine the **philosophical constraints**. Behind any decision in the field of education one can find a certain conception of human beings or a theory about their emancipation. Decisions can be taken having either Erasmus or Dewey in mind. As long as the ideas inspiring the strategies of universities are part of the common fund of the recognized European heritage, there is no reason whatsoever why freedom of choice should not be exercised to the full. There is no major jeopardy in following up the training of young people which is theory-centred or practice-oriented, audacious or cautious, with a wider or narrower knowledge horizon,or one which is more conservative or more innovative. The autonomy of higher education institutions will lead to the provision of society with a **large variety** of types of people, knowledge, skills, and vocations. The real problems emerge when academic decision-makers have to take into account the general policies of the public authorities and the availability and management of funds.

VI. University Strategies and General Policies

18. At another decision-making level than that of the higher education institutions themselves, **governmental policies** are elaborated which represent constraints on academic decision-making. The implications can be direct in many fields: the number of candidates who can be admitted to higher education; the territorial distribution of institutions of higher education; the number and size of the latter; the recognition of the diplomas granted by them, etc. Usually, a law on higher education will clearly stipulate the relationship between the government and academic institutions, defining the functions of the latter. But the autonomy thus gained in European countries through an ample variety of legislative acts is subjected to the requirements which the general policy of the public authorities and their economic, social, and scientific programmes envisage for universities. Taking the socio-economic aspects as an example, the general policy regarding employment gives preference to particular professions and trades, which are not necessarily the focus of the attention of universities.

19. Most of the consequences for the local strategies of higher education institutions derive from the policies and technical and scientific programmes devised by the respective states as a result of the recognition of science as the principal factor of industrial and economic success. About half of the new scientific achievements is produced in higher education; the other half is accomplished in governmental and private research institutes. The role played by research is the main source of prestige and of equipment for universities today. Fully aware of their own interests, universities are striving to increase this role by giving great priority to research.

20. The main bone of contention between governments and parliaments, on the one hand and the academic community on the other, is not a requirement that higher education produce a large number of scientific innovations. To a great extent, the dissatisfaction derives from the fact that governments and parliaments perceive more acutely than the academic community the profoundly competitive nature of the world economy and the need for a more aggressive attitude on the part of their industries in the struggle for new markets, through decisive technological innovations and scientific knowledge. These require scientific production which can be easily applied and will yield immediate results. Academics, no matter how familiar they are with the race for priority discoveries, are educated more in the spirit of co-operation and of long-term objectives than in the spirit of competitiveness and of immediate profit. They find it difficult to replace the saying, "publish or perish" by "invent or perish". The pressure coming from governments is being multiplied by the calls of regional bodies that the European economy be raised through science to a higher level of competitiveness and efficiency.

21. Here is the place to ask whether the gaining of a better economic position through science and technology is a national commandment, and if so, why it is more rapidly perceived and acquired by parliaments or by banking-financial circles than by the academic community. Why are the antennae of the latter less sensitive and their reaction times slower? Among the many explanations, one can identify an easily remedied cause of the problem. Turning one's face from the past towards the future takes place by promoting the anticipatory dimension of education as a whole, by elaborating courses of study including future-oriented technological and economic studies, and by setting up fora for debates with persons from outside the university which attract the imaginations of students.

VII. Autonomy and Financing

22. European universities are characterized by a high degree of **financial dependence** on national state budgets. It is hardly necessary to mention that funds are not given away anywhere in the world without strings attached. The conditions imposed may be the attainment of certain goals, the fulfillment of particular functions, or the performance of designated tasks. Taxpayers ask legitimate questions, through the parliaments, about the ways in which public money is spent. At the same time, the allocations assigned to health and education in the developed European countries have reached levels which challenge their economic potentials (7). Be it as it may, the simple and harsh reality is that the funds available to operate universities in keeping with the proportions and standards which they desire are far from adequate.

23. A rapid response to this problem is determined by the ability of higher education institutions to preserve or to increase their decision-making autonomy, namely the attention which they pay to **accountability**. Public reports, the transparency of operations (many more financial scandals take place in the political arena than in the academic world), the presentation of results, and the demonstration of cost-effectiveness (regardless of the difficulty in defining efficiency in educational operations) are useful ways of increasing the credibility of universities in terms of the use of funds.

24. The **diversification of financial resources** is also recommendable. Some universities base their budgets on the following sources: one-third from the state budget; one-third, from tuition fees; and another one-third, from contracts and endowments. Many universities return to students a part of their tuition fees in the form of grants and scholarships. Other institutions of higher education sponsor the operation of certain productive units: farms and factories which manufacture scientific equipment or prototypes; or they try to raise money from the revenues obtained from the lands and other properties which they might own. When will university banks come into being?

25. Higher education institutions do not pay a sufficient amount of attention to **public relations** or make efforts aimed at improving their image in social consciousness. Thus universities are more likely to be associated in the public mind with the occupation of a dean's office by students than with a result which has an impact on the future of the nation. With regard to funding, the successful resource hunter is preceded in our times by the specialist in public relations.

VIII. Autonomy, Sponsors, and Partners

26. The opening of higher education institutions to **industry** is a phenomenon which has been registering remarkable results in a variety of forms: individual and collective contracts; joint research; common laboratories and industrial or science parks; areas on university campuses in which various companies may set up offices; university consulting firms, etc. These practices will undoubtedly continue, and the experience gained will circulate among interested persons and organizations.

27. The **new sponsors**, particularly firms and companies, will certainly make their requirements known, sometimes in a more direct way than is characteristic of the public authorities. There are ways to defend autonomy and to resist the new outside pressures which risk altering academic standards and objectives. If this interdependence is skilfully managed, the universities are bound to benefit. In addition to the obvious advantages, such as access to advanced technologies and to challenging projects, the universities will be acquainted with ideas, methods, and procedures which will renew their fund of knowledge. The co-operation between universities, with their traditions of free circulation of scientific discoveries, and other profit-oriented institutions, for which ideas and particularly technological innovations are valuable assets, raises delicate and still unsolved problems of **intellectual property**, while the nocuous and undesirable aspects of several research projects bring to the forefront questions concerning the **ethics of science**.

28. Finally, among the most reliable partners of universities will be other universities in the country or from abroad. European mobility was first thought up by the master builders and the doctors of medieval universities. The strength of universities resides in their **network of permanent contacts**, required by the inner nature of scientific research. Today these networks are being rebuilt under the sign of institutionalization, benefitting from the rapid communications technologies via satellites and computers. By co-operating among themselves, academic institutions can form one of the most articulate communities in society, both for the defense of their own status and for the exploration and advancement of the general interest.

29. From the perspective of present-day valuable experience, autonomy does not emerge simply as a static juridical concept, but as a feature undergoing continuous change, adaptation, and assertion. Autonomy manifests itself in the **interactions** between old and new partners as a permanently acknowledged guarantee of the identity of universities as parts of the established relations. If according to the rhetoric of the last decade, the search for dialogue was dominant, the present is giving priority to **negotiation** to the extent even that any peaceful and prosperous society may

be qualified as a society of uninterrupted negotiation. As this negotiation is oriented towards interaction, the topical task of higher education institutions becomes that of controlling and managing interaction.

IX. The Exercise of Autonomy Through Initiatives, Actions, and Projects

30. The strengthening of university autonomy and of academic freedom can be achieved through: a) their assertion in declarations of principle and their systematic study and discussion; b) follow-up juridical enactments in internationally recognized instruments; c) their implementation in practice through **actions** and **projects**, the initiation and support of which are an attestation of the identity and status of universities at the societal level. While no opportunity should be lost with regard to "(a)", given that "(b)" will be time- and energy-consuming, we cannot help remarking that "(c)" is the necessary and urgent orientation. It resides in the launching of actions which, by promoting academic interests, would be consistent with the general and current interests of society at large.

31. The first group of actions, which are by no means exhaustively presented here, would be directed at facilitating contacts and co-operation schemes between the members of the European academic community (teachers and students) through:

a) the creation of **networks** of advanced training, research, and retraining units (for young postgraduates), which should meet three conditions: to be **residential centres, centres of communication, and centres of excellence**. The recent UNESCO programme, UNITWIN, promotes solidarity among universities based on twinning, networking, and other linking arrangements at subregional, regional, and interregional levels, with the UNESCO Chairs as the main component (8). Relevant experience has been accumulated, in this respect, also by means of the Monnet Chairs (9); The networking is also present in the project of the "Network: European Universities" (10).

b) the launching of a **voucher** system by UNESCO (inspired by the experience of the UNESCO coupons), which should ensure room and board, as in the case of students, for persons seconded to training in residential centres. The host unit would reuse these vouchers for the secondment of its own staff;

c) the issuing of a European **academic passport** intended to facilitate travelling within the networks and the acquisition of other advantages which universities at first, and other institutions later, could offer.

32. The second group of actions is aimed at raising the scholarly level, quality, and relevance, as well as the flexibility, of curricula through:

a) experimentation on a larger scale with course **modules** and curricula made up of **building-blocks**;

b) publication of textbooks and **European modules** meant to foster the modernization and the updating of the contents of education, and to contribute to the shifting of the emphasis from teaching to learning;

c) application of a more developed **prize-awarding system** to acknowledge the originality of various discoveries, innovations, and solutions to present-day problems (e.g., the European academic award in the field of ecology).

33. The third initiative is aimed at reaffirming the universal mission of the European university through:

a) the multiplication of solidarity and co-operation campaigns with **all regions of the world**;

b) the organization of a major event marking, in this decade, the **50th anniversary** of the creation of major organizations of a universal scope: UN, UNESCO, and other UN specialized bodies - and focussing in ample debates on the universal dimension of education, science, and culture (11).

34. The fourth current function of universities resides in the expansion of their range of academic activities to include modern types and methods required by **lifelong education**, especially in the framework of advanced training, retraining, and upgrading courses, as well as in **inter- and multi-disciplinary ones**. This expanding area can be recovered from various non-university sponsors, by joint sponsorship, which assumes the use of new methods and forms (**open university, distance learning**).

35. The last aspect concerns the organization of **joint ventures**, of state and private institutions to carry out research- or production-oriented activities (firms and companies) in the fields of science and staff training. The success of such projects also depends on the development of

aptitudes for initiative (as an attribute of autonomy), for creativity and innovation among academic staff members.

*

* *

36. Universities all over Europe are expected to act as institutions of seminal importance. Their eventual ascendancy is, however, neither self-evident nor free of outside obstacles. The idea of the university is itself at a crossroad. It must follow the inner logic of its own development and, at the same time, it has to respond rationally and extensively to those forces originating in the social environment, i.e. to meet growing demand for higher education and expanding national needs for economic, cultural, and technological development. Giving pre-eminence to one at the expense of the other would be very one-sided. Yet these two roles of universities do not complement each other, since the inner logic of universities is under pressure from the economy, from governments, from the public, and from the students themselves. Indeed, students expect the university to help them increase their mastery of those utilitarian skills needed for a better, more comfortable life. Yet universities still require freedom, detachment, autonomy, and opportunities for reflection in ways which adapt them to the requirements of a new age, thus enabling them to serve the intellectual needs of people.

Universities are presently at a stage of self-examination, which means that they must rely on their ability to promote their institutional autonomy and to preserve the basic principles of academic freedom. At the same time they must elaborate ways of responding to the expectations of society. The more we reflect upon these issues and stimulate the dialogue, the more we may know how to conceive and practise university autonomy and academic freedom.

Notes

1. Edward Shils. **Academic Freedom**. *International Higher Education. An Encyclopedia.* Philip G. Altbach (ed.). Garland Publ. Inc. New York & London, 1991.

2. L. Cerych. **Renewal of Central European Higher Education: issues and challenges**. *EurJourn. of Ed.*, vol. 25, No.4, 1990; V.N. Constantinescu. **Gînduri despre viitor**, Bucuresti, 1991.

3. *** *Droits de l'homme et relations internationales*, Masson 1989; A.M. Revedin (ed.). *Diritti dell'uomo e ideologie contemporanee*, Padova, 1988.

4. Graham Haydon. **Towards "a framework of commonly accepted values". Education for a pluralist society**. *Bedford Way Papers 30* London, 1987.

5. *** *Declaration de Lima relative aux libertés académiques et à l'autonomie des établissements d'enseignement supérieur*. Entreaide Universitaire Mondiale, Genève, 1988.

6. *** *Vancouver Declaration UNESCO Symposium on Science and Culture for the 21 Century*, Québec, 1990; *Common Responsibility in the 1990's*, The Stockholm Initiative, 1991; *Statement by the Club of Rome on Human Responsibility*, Nov. 1991.

7. Jacques Attali, *Lignes d'horizon*. Fayard, Paris, 1990.

8. Federico Mayor. **For the rapid transfer of knowledge: the UNITWIN Programme and the UNESCO Chair Schemes**. UNESCO, 1991.

9. *** **Higher Education in the European Community towards the Year 2000**. *Universitas Quademi 9 Rome 1991; Memorandum on Higher Education in the European Community*, Brussels, 1991.

10. Carin Berg. **The University of the Peoples of Europe - A Feasibility Study**. *Higher Education in Europe*, Vol. XV, No. 2, 1990.

11. René Maheu. *La civilisation de l'avenir*, Robert Laffont, Paris, 1966.

12. *** *Magna Charta Universitatum Europaearum*, Bologna 1988.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF CEPES

On the eve of the Conference, CEPES - the European Centre for Higher Education of UNESCO - marked its 20 years of existence. Established in Bucharest in 1972, CEPES played an important role in asserting the fact that UNESCO considered Europe to be a whole, even when it was politically and ideologically divided, and kept communications open between the two parts of the continent. Despite difficulties and obstacles, it contributed to the flow of information and ideas among the different systems of higher education, regularly publishing a review and organizing over 50 meetings on topical issues, thus providing one of the rare meeting places where scholars from both East and West could meet. In the new European context, the location of the Centre in Bucharest should be considered a valuable asset, underlining the fact that CEPES does not belong to a western European organization, but is part of a global organization with the specific mission to reflect on the needs and aspirations of all the countries of the Europe Region.

At the celebration held in Sinaia on the 4th of May, presided by Dr. Gottfried Leibbrandt, the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, Ms Carin Berg, the Director of CEPES, gave a presentation of the experience of the Centre over the last twenty years, of its current activities, and of its future plans. The fact that CEPES has a wider scope than many European organizations, because it includes North America and Israel, coupled to its long experience in dealing with the countries of eastern and central Europe, makes the Centre particularly apt at undertaking pan-European projects, as well as assuring the trans-Atlantic link. However, Ms Berg stressed the necessity of closer co-operation with all the organizations active in the field of higher education in Europe, especially the Council of Europe, the European Communities, OECD, and non-governmental organizations like CRE.

CEPES is prepared to accept a wider responsibility in close co-operation with the member states and interested organizations. Continually emphasizing the importance of its function as a clearing-house for information on higher education in Europe, CEPES has undertaken measures to strengthen its capacities and competency in this field. The UNICOM electronic network, initiated and financed by the government of the Netherlands, will link CEPES with its liaison officers in all the countries of Europe and through them to the members of the other CEPES networks as well as to individual universities. In addition, UNICOM will provide access to existing academic databases. CEPES is thus acquiring a high performance tool for communication, which, in collaboration with the liaison officers, will greatly improve the collection and dissemination of relevant and accurate information, this serving as a knowledge base not

only to provide decision-makers and institutions with information, but as a base for all the other activities of CEPES.

The representatives of the Romanian Government, the Ministry of Education and Science, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Ministry of Culture expressed their satisfaction with CEPES and pledged the continued assistance of the Romanian government to the work of CEPES in the future.

The Director-General of UNESCO, Professor Federico Mayor, praised the work of CEPES and explained the special role which he intends it to play in the overall strategy and the activities of UNESCO. He announced that he had decided to make increased resources available to CEPES for its activities of this biennium (1992-1993). The Director-General emphasized the key role of quality, required of all institutions which want to survive in a highly competitive world, and the necessity of concentrating on specific tasks, avoiding overlapping or mission-oriented activities. CEPES is able, by means of the competent expertise which it can bring to the fore, to render assistance to the European universities in the solution of their problems and to generate co-operation among them. Professor Mayor urged CEPES to undertake reflections on the themes of primordial importance for the development of higher education not only in Europe but in the whole world.

The Director-General further unveiled the plans for the strengthening of CEPES and its future role, which are to be discussed in the forthcoming session of the Executive Board of UNESCO, the most promising option being that of transforming CEPES into an inter-agency Center. While continuing to undertake useful work for the development of higher education in Europe, CEPES should mirror the universalistic character of UNESCO and promote co-operation with all the regions of the world.

CEPES is the acronym for
CENTRE EUROPEEN POUR L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPERIEUR
(European Centre for Higher Education). It is an integral part of the UNESCO Secretariat, with headquarters in Bucharest. The Centre was created in 1972 to contribute to the development of higher education in the Member States of the Europe Region by promoting international co-operation in this field.

CEPES works in three domains:

- it gathers, processes and disseminates information;
- it organizes meetings and collaborates in joint studies;
- it co-operates with other organizations and institutions, both national and international, to accomplish its goals.

CEPES est le sigle du
CENTRE EUROPEEN POUR L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPERIEUR.
Il fait partie intégrante du Secrétariat de l'UNESCO et se trouve à Bucarest. Le Centre a été créé en 1972 afin de contribuer au développement de l'enseignement supérieur dans les Etats membres de la région Europe par la promotion de la coopération internationale dans ce domaine.

Les activités du CEPES sont:

- la collecte, le traitement et la distribution de l'information;
- l'organisation de réunions et la participation dans des projets communs;
- la coopération avec d'autres organisations et institutions, nationales ou internationales,

pour la réalisation de ses objectifs.